

## **Chang, Lisa**

---

**From:** Chang, Lisa  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 13, 2015 11:03 AM  
**To:** Bonifaci, Angela  
**Subject:** RE: Update on Swinomish

Dan said he didn't necessarily need to see it before it goes back to Tiffany.

I am just waiting on getting feedback from someone in Cara's group. Once I have Cara's feedback, I will roll her and Jill's feedback into ours, then we can send it off. I think it would be good for you to look it over before I do that, however. Cara said she would get eyes on it today.

**From:** Bonifaci, Angela  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 13, 2015 10:54 AM  
**To:** Chang, Lisa  
**Subject:** Re: Update on Swinomish

That's fine. I received a call from Larry yesterday asking where the feedback was. I explained that we were quickly going over the facts being presented as a "fact checking" assist to them, because we certainly didn't want them coming off as not credible. He was fine with that and made it very clear that he does not want anything on the website that cannot be backed up. So, I think we need to be very careful in how we couch the feedback to Larry, and present it as trying to help out in the "fact checking" department. I believe he will appreciate that and be more open to it.

He expressed concern that we keep coming to an agreement when we meet, but then we go away and move the goal post again. I can see where he is coming from.

So, will Dan and I see the final feedback before you send it to Tiffany?

The sooner we get back to Larry, the better.

Thanks, Lisa.  
Angela

--

**Angela Bonifaci | Acting Program Manager**  
**EPA Puget Sound National Estuary Program**  
206.553.0332 | [bonifaci.angela@epa.gov](mailto:bonifaci.angela@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Chang, Lisa  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 13, 2015 9:57 AM  
**To:** Bonifaci, Angela  
**Subject:** Update on Swinomish

Angela,

Tiffany called late yesterday and said Larry refuses to allow ECY to weigh in on any of the website content. I think we will have to say that any factual assertions relating to impaired waters that he cannot demonstrate how he derived from publically available and current data should NOT be included in the website.

So, as I see how this review process is shaking out, there are 3 levels of review – one is policy/tone, which you and Dan set; the second is programmatic/regulatory, which Karen Burgess and ORC can help with; and the third is technical (where Jill and to some extent I can help with).

At Dan's request, I ran this by Karen Burgess yesterday and she provided helpful input from an NPDES/OWW program perspective. I just sent this to Jill and to Cara Steiner-Riley, who committed to getting ORC CWA eyes on it today.

Once we have their feedback, I suggest that we send the documents to Tiffany and then recommend we have a phone conversation with Larry and Tiffany to walk them through the basis of our edits. Every edit has a policy, programmatic/regulatory, or technical basis, and it's important they understand that.

What do you think?

Lisa